



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 2001

No. 111

House of Representatives

□ 1715

BIPARTISAN PATIENT PROTECTION ACT

(Continued)

Who are jurors? Jurors are our neighbors, our voters. They are the American people. Trust them. When it comes to understanding what it costs to be deprived of a full and healthy life, jurors know what it means. They have more wisdom than lawyers, than doctors, and I dare say than Members of Congress.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I was listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about what this bill does. The Ganske-Dingell bill provides real patient protection, whether it is access to emergency care, specialists, whether it is primary care.

The Norwood amendment takes away those rights because there is no enforcement. There is no reason why HMOs will provide these particular protections. It is the opponents of the Ganske-Dingell bill that are telling Members that this Norwood amendment will perfect it.

What it does is take away the protections in the underlying bill. We should reject the Norwood amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, the debate today is not about the technicalities of a complicated piece of legislation: who has the rebuttal presumption, what the standard of care should be, whether patients are going to be suing in Federal court for this issue or State court for that.

This issue boils down to one simple proposition. If someone is in the busi-

ness of making medical decisions that affect the health, welfare and lives of patients, that individual should be held to the same standard of responsibility as anyone else involved in that process, period. No exceptions. No carve-outs. No special treatments based on political contributions made in this place. That is what is at stake at the end of today's debate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Norwood special treatment amendment and instead pass a fair Patients' Bill of Rights.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, here is what two law professors from New Jersey say:

"In preempting State law, the Norwood amendment goes beyond conduct that involves negligent medical judgment to a particular patient's case. The amendment may, by virtue of the words 'based on,' stipulate that State malpractice law does not apply to any treatment decision made by a managed care organization, whether it be negligent, reckless, willful or wanton.

"For example, no State cause of action can be maintained against a designated decision-maker for his decision to discharge a patient early from a hospital even if the likely result of that discharge would be the patient's death. In short, all forms of vicarious liability under State law would be preempted under the Norwood amendment."

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying that we are in a sad state of affairs when we have dentists writing law and lawyers practicing medicine, and Congressmen trying to run HMOs. I have a list of 704 organizations that support the original Ganske-Dingell bill without the poison pill amendments.

There is not a health care professional organization in this country

that does not support this bill, and the dental organization of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) supports the original bill. Why should we vote against those people that give us medical care? Do we know better? Is there somebody in this audience who would tell me of any medical profession that does not support the original bill and oppose the Norwood amendment?

If we are going to legislate to protect patients, let us make sure that we do it right and support the original Ganske-Dingell bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Ganske-Dingell bill would subject employers and unions, including many small businesses that voluntarily provide health benefits to their employees, to new lawsuits with unlimited damages and no protection from frivolous lawsuits.

I think it is pretty clear that Americans want a Patients' Bill of Rights. I think they have made it very clear, as well, that they do not want unlimited lawsuits. Expanding liability for small employers and unions who voluntarily offer health plans is wrong-headed and dangerous, and in my view, will cause millions of Americans to lose their coverage.

Mr. Chairman, all of us who serve in this body come from different walks of life. We have doctors that serve in the House. They happen to be split on both sides of this particular issue. We have our share of lawyers that occupy this body as our colleagues, and we have lawyers on both sides of this particular issue.

In my own case, I come to the halls of Congress as a small business person, someone who has in fact hired people, someone who has had to run a business, and someone who offered a health plan to my employees. I can tell my colleagues, as I have said year after year, debate after debate on this particular subject that if the underlying bill were

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5213